REMARKS

Claims 12 and 17-20 are all the claims pending in the application.

Objection to Amendment and Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

In the Office Action at page 2, the Examiner objects to the Amendment filed March 5, 2007 for introducing new matter that allegedly is not supported in the original claims or specification. Specifically, it is asserted in the Office Action that "[t]here is no disclosure in the original claims or specification of which elements correspond to a means for releasably coupling the piston to a front head of the pusher or a releasable means for securing the syringe to a front face of the injector."

Applicant points out that support for the claim elements the Examiner identifies is found in the application as originally filed. (The original claims (1-9) and the drawings of an application are part of its disclosure.) For example, Figs. 10-12 clearly show structure that is releasable for securing the piston (13) to a front head of the pusher (5). See also, for example, page 3, line 22 through page 5, line 13. These figures also show releasable structure for securing the syringe (1) to the front face (4) of the injector (2). *Id.* and page 5, line 14 to page 6, line 9.

(Further, both "means for releasably coupling the piston to a front head of a pusher," and "releasable means for securing the syringe to a front face of the injector" were recited at least in the claims of the Preliminary Amendment filed June 21, 2005, the filing date of the application, thereby forming a portion of the specification of the present application. For example, claim 15, contained in the Preliminary Amendment filed on the same day as the present application, recites these features.)

The specification as originally filed also provides additional support for this amendment. See, for example, page 1, line 15. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments of March 5, 2007 are supported by the originally filed written description.

Claims 12 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that the elements of claims 12 and 17-20 were disclosed in the specification and/or Preliminary Amendment filed on the same day as the present application, as discussed above, and are supported by a written description.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 12 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner asserts that these claims are directed to the embodiments shown in Figs. 9-16, which have a support device (3) that includes a recess that presents a non-circular cross-section and also a central portion that is circularly arcuate in cross section. The Examiner states that it is unclear how the device can have recess with a circular cross section (half disk 21) and also a non-circular cross-section, as recited in claim 19.

Applicant submits that the present claims read on embodiments shown in Figs. 9-16. Figure 11, for example, shows a support device 3 that has a half disk 21 in which is formed a recess 24. See, for example, page 5, lines 16-24. The recess 24 includes a central portion that is circularly arcuate in cross-section, but that also has "two diametrically-opposite horizontal notches 32 opening out into the central portion 31 and substantially complementary in shape to the bottom halves of the tabs 30." See page 5, lines 19-22. Thus, the recess has a non-circular

cross section due to the notches 32 and the central portion of the recess, portion 31, has a circularly arcuate cross section. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are not indefinite.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 12 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Armbruster. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose each and every element of the claim in as complete detail as recited in the claim. Here, Armbruster does not disclose all the limitations of claim 19, and hence, does not anticipate claim 19 or the claims that depend therefrom.

Claim 19 recites a support device that includes a recess "that is open in a reception direction and presents firstly a non-circular cross-section that is complementary to a portion of the cross-section of the syringe body at the location of said projection". The recess includes "a central portion that is circularly arcuate in cross-section, and that is extended by two diametrically-opposite notches". Claim 19 also recites that "the central portion of the recess extends the inside surface of the cradle".

First, the Examiner appears to read the claimed recess as appearing in Fig. 1 of Armbruster. A flange (52) of the syringe, allegedly corresponding to the claimed projections, is disposed in a recess. However, Armbruster does not disclose that a central portion of such a recess extends (i.e., is in the extension of) the inside surface of a cradle as recited in claim 19. Even if the Examiner deems Armbruster to disclose a recess with a central portion that is

circularly arcuate in cross-section, it is respectfully submitted that Armbruster does not disclose that such a recess extends the inside surface of a cradle. In Fig. 2, Armbruster shows a flange 52 disposed in a slot (not numbered). Armbruster also shows in Fig. 10 an engagement slot 72 that is positioned behind what appears to be a semicircular support member (unnumbered). Armbruster, however, fails to disclose or suggest that either of these slots extends the inside surface of that support member.

Accordingly, Armbruster's syringe would not be "removable in a forward direction" by a sliding movement of the flange "along said central portion, and then along said inside surface of the cradle," as recited in claim 19. Accordingly, Armbruster does not anticipate claim 19 or any of the claims that depend therefrom.

Also, Armbruster does not satisfy the limitation in claim 19 concerning a recess that has "a central portion that is circularly arcuate in cross-section." Rather, Armbruster discloses at column 5, lines 23-25, that the recess is "complementary" to flange (52), i.e., has the polygonal shape shown in Fig. 9.

Regarding the embodiment shown in Fig. 10, even if recess 72 is deemed to have a central portion that is circularly arcuate in cross section, the embodiment does not satisfy other limitations recited in claim 19. For example, claim 19 recites that "the system is arranged in such a manner that turning the syringe through 90° causes it to be lifted by one of the tabs cooperating with the bottom of the associated notch, then with said central portion." As explained in the previous Amendment, the embodiment of Armbruster shown in Fig. 10-16 does not meet these claim limitations. As can be seen in Figs. 15 and 16, protrusion 74 prevents the

flange 92 from being rotated. Rather than operating in the manner claimed, Armbruster requires manually lifting of the syringe to remove it forwardly. Accordingly, this embodiment of Armbruster also does not satisfy the limitations of claim 19.

In summary, then, and in reference to page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that, in the Armbruster device, "said central portion extends the inside surface of the cradle". At page 5, first paragraph, the Examiner states that the syringe is removable by a sliding movement of one tab along said central portion of the recess and then along said inside surface of the cradle.

Applicant respectfully submits that these statements are clearly **erroneous**, and this is acknowledged in the same paragraph by the Examiner who writes at page 5, lines 2-3: "see Figure 2, the recess that the tabs 52 would be located in if turned by 90° is very small".

More specifically, a critical, novel and patentable (non-obvious) difference between the present invention and Armbruster, is Applicant's claim limitation: "... *wherein said central portion [of the recess] extends the inside surface of the cradle".*

In Armbruster, Figs 1-3, the syringe flange (52) "locates and fixes syringe within a complementary "slot" in front (16) of the power injector" (column 5, lines 23-25). A small portion of the slot is visible on Fig. 2, just above numeral 24. Such slot is the claimed "recess". The inside surface of the cradle (on the left side of said slot) clearly **does not extend** the central portion of the slot.

The same remark also applies to the second embodiment (Figs. 10-16) of Armbruster. See in particular Fig. 10, in which the slot 72, which is complementary to the syringe flange (see Fig. 16), also has its bottom below the level of the inside surface of the cradle.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Armbruster does not anticipate claim 19 or any of the claims that depend from claim 19.

Claim 12 and 17-20 also are rejected under 35 USC 102 (e) as being anticipated by Spohn et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The passage bridging pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action appears to refer to Figure 1 of Spohn et al. However, Figure 1 merely discloses a bayonet-type connection in which:

- the recess (behind 68a, 68b) is totally circular, and is **not** extended by two diametrically-opposite notches;

- turning the syringe through 90° **does not** cause the syringe to be lifted; and

- turning the syringe through 90° does not cause the syringe and the pusher to be disconnected.

Accordingly, since the mounting flanges 22a and 22b are circularly shaped, turning the syringe 90° will not cause the syringe to be lifted by one of the flanges. Accordingly, Spohn does not teach all the limitations of claim 19, and hence, does not anticipate claim 19.

Also, with reference to the dependent claims, the "reception direction" in which the Spohn recess is open is **not** the claimed "reception direction", and the notch is **not** connected to a convex curved surface. Accordingly, Spohn does not anticipate the dependent claims also for these reasons.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all objections and rejections and to find the application to be in condition for allowance with claims 12 and 17-20. However, if for any reason **the Examiner feels that the application is not now in**

condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant files concurrently herewith a Petition (with fee) for an Extension of Time of two months. Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/John H. Mion/
John H. Mion
Registration No. 18,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 21, 2007